DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 093 329 IR 000 816

TITLE	Intensive Evaluation of Satellite TV Impact on Four Alaskan Villages. Supplement to Basic ESCD Evaluation Design.
INSTITUTION	Practical Concepts, Inc., Washington, D.C.
SPONS AGENCY	National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Office of Programmatic Research and Development.
PUB DATE	17 May 74
CONTRACT	NIE-C-74-0047
NOTE	17p.; For related documents see IR 000 815-818
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.75 HC-$1.50 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS	*Communication Satellites; Educational Assessment; *Educational Television; *Evaluation; Sociocultural Patterns; *Sociology; Surveys; *Television Research
IDENTIFIERS	Alaska; Education Satellite Communications Demonstration

ABSTRACT

A supplement to the final report, "Design for an Analysis and Assessment of the Education Satellite Communications Demonstration (ESCD)," this document is both: (1) a separable, sociologically oriented evaluation of the ESCD impact on Alaskan native villages; and (2) a direct extension of the work described in sections 4 and 5 in the Practical Concepts Incorporated (PCI) final report. (Those sections describe "Measurement of Satellite TV on the Way Educational Institutions and Technology are Perceived," and "Measurement of the Impact of Satellite TV on Educational Institutions and Behavior Toward Them," respectively.) Primary features of PCI's proposed "Intensive Evaluation of Satellite TV Impact on Four Alaskan Villages" are: (1) the use of knowledgeable, sensitive social scientists now working in Alaska to help PCI focus on questions and issues peculiar to satellite TV in Alaska, and to augment the data collection and analysis described in the PCI final report; and (2) the use of trained native Alaskans to help PCI focus on questions and issues peculiar to satellite TV in Alaska, and to collect data that would otherwise be impossible to obtain. (WCM)

ED 093329

INTENSIVE EVALUATION OF SATELLITE TV IMPACT ON FOUR ALASKAN VILLAGES

SUPPLEMENT TO BASIC ESCD EVALUATION DESIGN

Prepared for:

National Institute of Education
1832 M Street, N. W.
Marsh Building, Room 721c
Washington, D. C. 20208

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

By:

Practical Concepts Incorporated
1030 Fifteenth Street, N. W.
Suite 940
Washington, D. C. 20005

May 17, 1974

IR 000 816

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
SECTION I:	Introduction	1
SECTION II:	Basis for our Special Interest in the Alaska Experiment	3 3
SECTION III:	Sample Evaluation Topics	6
SECTION IV:	Selection of Villages for Intensive Evaluation	8
SECTION V:	Evaluation Tasks and Team	12
	A. The Project Team	12
	1. Social Scientists working in Alaska	
	2. Native Alaskan Data Collectors	
	B. Evaluation Tasks	13
	C. Schedule of Activities	15

SECTION I

INTRODUCTION

This document supplements the final report entitled "Design for an Analysis and Assessment of the Education Satellite Communications Demonstration (ESCD)" (submitted by Practical Concepts Incorporated in accordance with Contract NIE-C-74-0047).

The approach described here for studying satellite TV impact on Native Alaskan Villages was developed in cooperation with Mr. Adrian Parmeter, who has conducted field investigations in Alaska as Staff Director of the Senate Subcommittee on Indian Education (1968-1969).

This document is both:

1. A separable, sociologically oriented evaluation of the ESCD impact on Alaskan Native Villages; and,

2. A direct extension of the work described in Sections IV and V in the PCI Final Report. (Those sections describe "Measurement of Satellite TV on the Way Educational Institutions and Technology are Perceived," and "Measurement of the Impact of Satellite TV on Educational Institutions and Behavior toward Them," respectively.)

Our special interest in the Alaska experiment is based both on the fact that ESCD will be a significant portion of the total TV exposure for many participants, and because *it is in Alaska that satellite TV is a feasible near-term alternative to conventional schooling.*

Primary features of PCI's proposed "Intensive Evaluation of Satellite TV Impact on Four Alaskan Villages" are:

1. Use of knowledgeable, sensitive social scientists now working in Alaska to help PCI focus on questions and issues peculiar

to satellite TV in Alaska, and to augment the data collection and analysis described in the PCI final report;

2. Use of trained native Alaskans to help PCI focus on questions and issues peculiar to satellite TV in Alaska, and to collect data that would otherwise be impossible to obtain.

SECTION II

BASIS OF OUR SPECIAL INTEREST IN THE ALASKA EXPERIMENT

Of the three regions included in the Communications Demonstration, Alaska is clearly a special case requiring special treatment. The primary focus of the ESCD in the Alaska Region is the Alaskan Native Village, thus placing the demonstration in the category of a complex cross-cultural transaction. Not only are these Native Villages dramatically different in terms of life-style, language and cultural background, but placed in a State or National context they share certain other unique characteristics. The present educational programs, at both the village elementary school level, and at regional (boarding) secondary schools, constitute the most extreme educational failure to be found anywhere in the U.S. This fact was extensively documented by the Senate Subcommittee on Indian Education in 1969, and by such recent research reports as Dr. Judith Kleinfeld's study *A Long Way from Home*. Dr. Kleinfeld's report also raises a policy question of extraordinary importance to Alaska. Dr. Kleinfeld contends that (1) a generation of Native students has been "destroyed" by the present practice of separation from home, family, and village and placement in district boarding high schools, and (2) the best solution to this problem is to provide effective secondary programs in Native Villages.

Satellite TV is a plausible, potentially cost-effective educational device to meet this need.

The potential of our in-depth assessment of satellite TV in Alaska is therefore enormous and immediate. This potential was not fully addressed in depth in our "basic" evaluation design because (1) our first assumption was that such issues of *operational* improvement can and will be successfully addressed by the Regional evaluators, and (2) we were concerned that our on-site investigators would be overly obtrusive. Because of the *national* importance of this issue, and informal indicators that Alaskan evaluators would much welcome

help with this important issue, we have overcome the latter "technical" obstacle by supplementing our PCI staff with sociologists and data collectors already working in the villages.

Another factor of critical importance is the recent passage of the Alaskan Native Land Claim Legislation, which provided a settlement of 40 million acres of land to Native Villages and Regional Corporations, and one billion dollars in cash compensation for the extinguishment of title to the rest of the Alaskan land mass. This settlement places an enormous opportunity and burden on the Native community. Nothing is more important to the long-term success of this settlement legislation than effective educational programs and well trained Native leaders. Thus, one is confronted with the paradox of an extraordinary demand for educational programs which have proved ineffective and dysfunctional in their present form.

Confronting this paradox, Alaska and its Native community have seized upon satellite TV as the ultimate solution to their educational problems, and expectations could be characterized as very high. This raises a second paradox. There are substantial dangers and many potentially negative effects of satellite TV for Native Villages. If it simply serves to reinforce an educational system which has proven a failure, if it serves to disrupt village life and cultural patterns, if it serves to strengthen government paternalism and Native dependency, if it serves as the final grand impersonal device for Native assimilation into the dominant society or the Native ghettos of urban Alaska, then the primary role of satellite TV will have been one of individual destruction and community impoverishment. Clearly, this is a situation demanding very careful and thorough evaluation.

One must also recognize, however, that Alaska as a special case presents some unique problems which demand special evaluation treatment. A considerable amount of previous evaluation work in Native villages has proven to be not only insensitive and inaccurate but drastically wrong in its conclusions. For example, Dr. Kleinfeld cites the example of a study conducted in 1966 for

the State Department of Education which provided the rationale for the Regional Boarding High School program. On the other hand Dr. Kleinfeld's evaluation of the various dimensions of failure of this program is a superb example of what can be achieved. What is required (and what PCI's team offers) is a great deal of sensitivity, a relationship of rapport and mutual respect with Native Alaskans, a capacity to listen and learn and shed ethnocentric perceptions, and a thorough knowledge of rural Alaskan and Native Villages.

SECTION III

SAMPLE EVALUATION TOPICS

Some topics we will address in the "Intensive Evaluation of Satellite TV Impact on Four Alaskan Villages" are peculiar to Alaska, or at least more important for Alaska than for other ESCD sites. The list below is by no means exhaustive. Our first study task will be to work with Alaskan Natives, and social scientists working in Alaska, to flesh out the list and make sure we address the important issues.

1. To what extent can and should satellite TV be used to replace real school alternatives for Native Alaskan students? In particular, to what extent can and should satellite TV be used to replace boarding schools for Alaskan Native students?

2. How effectively has control of satellite TV programming and in-village use been given over to Alaskan Natives? (Alaskan Native control is a primary expressed objective of ESCD in Alaska.)

3. To the extent that Alaskan Natives do not have control over satellite TV in Alaska, how can they gain control?

4. How can Alaskan Natives use satellite TV to strengthen their own cultural pride while at the same time obtaining needed and desired services from urban Alaska?

Primary tools for addressing the above will be: questionnaires and interviews administered by Native Alaskans, and the economic analysis described in Section VIII of the PCI final report. The required approach is to study satellite TV communications in the context of the entire Alaskan socio-economic and educational systems.

Some topics we will address in the "Intensive Evaluation of Satellite TV Impact on Four Native Villages" are *not* peculiar to Alaska, and they are covered in the PCI final report. However, use in data collection and analysis of

Native Alaskans and social scientists working in Alaska strengthens our original approach considerably.

In the main report, we refrained from proposing questionnaires and interviews for audiences and communities in Alaska because of obtrusiveness and cross-cultural differences. Now we can use Native Alaskans to ask questions which address the same issues we will be addressing elsewhere.

The general question posed in the questionnaires is: Does satellite TV change the way people perceive their local educational institutions, and the way they see high technology such as satellite TV? In particular: Does satellite TV make educational institutions and technology seem more accessible to local community control? And does satellite TV make educational institutions and technology seem more responsive to local needs? For more details and prototype questionnaires, see Section IV-A of the final report.

The Native Alaskan participants and the social scientists will also help us with the "Measurement of Satellite TV Impact on Educational Institutions and Behavior toward Them," and the "Linguistic Analysis" described in Sections V, and IV-C of the final report. Impact measurement requires collection of records such as those compiled by schools and libraries. Linguistic Analysis linguistic informants, and tape-recorded conversations from satellite TV-served villages. (Please refer to Section V and IV-C of the "basic" final report.)

SECTION IV

SELECTION OF VILLAGES FOR INTENSIVE EVALUATION

There are actually only 14 Native locations included in the Demonstration. Anchorage, Fairbanks, Juneau, Petersburg, and Valdez do not qualify. In addition, five of the fourteen locations have substantial white populations and should be classified as towns: Yakutat, McGrath, Galena, Craig, and Nenana. *The most important variable* between the 14 Native locations is Native Language spoken and frequency of usage by age and situation.

The sample 14 villages breaks down as follows (see Table I):

3 Tlingit
2 Central Yupik Eskimo
9 Athabaskan

The following major Native language groups have been left out of the Demonstration entirely:

Language	Population Estimate
Inupiaq (Arctic Eskimo)	11,000
Pacific Gulf Eskimo	3,000
Aleut	2,000
Siberian Yupik	1,000
Tsimshian	1,000
Haida	500

In addition, there is a severe under-representation of Central Yupik Eskimo, which has 15,000 fluent Native speakers at all age levels and where Eskimo is still the dominant tongue. The Central Eskimo villages included are geographically borderline Eskimo villages, where Eskimo and Indian populations are mixed and where Yupik might not be the dominant tongue of most school children. One can only conclude and take into consideration the fact that the Demonstration contains a badly skewed sample of Native villages.

TABLE I

ALASKA NATIVE LANGUAGE DISTRIBUTION AND FREQUENCY AMONG ATS-F DEMONSTRATION VILLAGES

(This information was derived from materials developed by the Alaskan Native Language Center.)

LANGUAGE	SITE	VILLAGE	TOWN (partly native)	NON-VILLAGE
Tlingit				
	Angoon	x**		
	Yakutat		x*	
	Petersburg			xN
	Craig		x*	
	Juneau			xN
Central Yupik Eskimo				
	Aniak	x***		
	Chuathbaluk	x***		
Athabaskan				
1. Upper Kuskokwim				
	Nikolai	x***		
	McGrath		x**	
2. Ingalik				
	Sleetmute	x**		
3. Koyukan				
	Tanana	x**		
	Galena		x**	
	Allakaket	x**		
4. Tanana				
	Minto	x**		
	Nenana		x*	
	Fairbanks			xN
5. Kutchin				
	Ft. Yukon	x***		
6. Tanaina				
	Anchorage			xN
7. Ahtena				
	Valdez			xN

Frequency Markings: N – None
** – Very little
*** – Some-mostly adults
*** – Substantial-many school children still speak fluently
**** – Dominant language

In terms of Native language usage frequency (a strong indicator of acculturation status) none of the 14 Native locations has a Native language as a dominant mode of expression or the dominant language of school children. Only three of the 14 Native locations qualify as villages where a substantial number of Native school children still speak the Native language fluently. Ft. Yukon has some children in this category. The other 10 villages all fall in the category of adult speakers only, varying from a substantial number of adults in some cases to almost none in others. In a majority of these villages English is probably the primary form of communication except for grandparents and older people.

The following criteria were applied in arriving at a carefully selected sample of Native villages for intensive study:

1. Each of the three major language groups included in the Demonstration should be represented (Athabaskan, Central Yupik, Eskimo, Tlingit);

2. Each of the three major language groups should be represented by a village where the Native language is still viable at all age levels and where many of the school children still speak their Native language fluently;

3. At least one of the villages should include a High School program which is predominantly Native;

4. The sample of villages should provide a range from almost no white population to considerable white population in residence;

5. The villages should vary in size from small to large and provide as much differentiation in terms of geographical locale as possible.

Based on these criteria the following villages have been chosen for intensive evaluation:

1. *Angoon* – a Tlingit village, from the Southeastern part of the State with a population of 400;

2. *Aniak/Chauthbaluk* – the only two Central Yupik Eskimo villages in the Demonstration, which are close enough together to be included jointly. They are from the Kuskokwim Southwest Delta region and have respective populations of 272 and 94. There is a substantially greater resident white population in Aniak which has commercial airport, and consequently greater white contact;

3. *Nikolai* – a traditional Athabaskan Indian village in Central Alaska with a population of 112;

4. *Ft. Yukon* – a large (population 448) Athabaskan Indian village on the upper Yukon River which is a regional trade center, has a significant white population, but the Kutchin language is still viable at all age levels. Ft. Yukon is also one of the rare villages that has a high school.

Some questions about ESCD in Alaska will require comparison between villages inside the Demonstration and villages outside the Demonstration. An example of such a question is: How are attitudes toward and knowledge about the Land Claims Act altered by satellite TV programming, in particular by the "Native Magazine?" For comparison purposes we have chosen the following pairs:

Angoon – Hoonah
Aniak/Chauthbaluk – Tuluksak
Nikolai – Lime Hills
Venetia – Ft. Yukon

We have tried to match the villages culturally and by village size.

SECTION V

EVALUATION TASKS AND TEAM

A. THE PROJECT TEAM

The evaluation tasks listed in this section will be undertaken under the direction of Practical Concepts Incorporated, in cooperation with the Center for Northern Educational Research, Fairbanks, Alaska. PCI's on-site director will be Dr. Roger Popper. Mr. Adrian Parmeter, who helped develop the approach described here, will be an advisory consultant.

The Center for Northern Educational Research was established and funded by the University of Alaska and the Ford Foundation following the final investigation and public hearings of the Senate Subcommittee on Indian Education. It is the primary center in Alaska for Research, Development, Policy Analysis, and Evaluation for improvement of education in rural Alaska. The Center is directed by Dr. Frank Darnell who has specialized in and directed many of the most important education efforts in village Alaska.

The planning and execution of the evaluation will be done with substantial Native input at all levels. The Native Consumer Committee founded by the Regional Contractor will be fully utilized, and the main data collection agents will be Native Villagers from each of the four villages. The data collectors will be trained and supported by the professional staff.

In addition to the staff available per our basic study plan, and in addition to the advisory services of Mr. Adrian Parmeter, PCI would supplement its team with social scientists and data collectors as noted in the following:

1. **Social Scientists Working in Alaska**

   PCI has been in communication with Dr. Frank Darnell, Director of the Center for Northern Educational Research (Fairbanks), and we have obtained the services of the following social scientists working at the Center:

a. Dr. Judith Kleinfeld, educational psychologist at the Center, and author of a landmark study of the impact of boarding high schools on Alaskan students titled "A Long Way from Home";

b. Dr. Michael Krauss, Director of the Alaskan Native Language Center, and an outstanding linguistic scientist specializing in Alaskan Native languages;

c. Dr. James Orvik, a social psychologist doing research for NSF and NIMH on Native Alaskan cultural identity and bilingualism.

The above individuals will be invaluable in helping PCI focus on issues of vital interest to Native Alaskans and Alaska in general, and in solving the data collection problems presented by ESCD in Alaska.

2. **Native Alaskan Data Collectors**

Precedents for effective training and use of Native Alaskan data collectors are:

a. Surveys by the Rowan Group, Inc., including the 1973 Rural Mortgage Study – NANA Region (PCI has a copy);

b. Studies of suicide trends and patterns, and epidemiological studies in Alaska by Dr. Harold Krauss;

c. Data collection in Alaska for the Indian Mental Health Program.

Dr. R. Bergman, Director of the Indian Mental Health Program, has suggested that the Program and PCI share Native data collectors. Dr. George Goldstein, Director of the Program's evaluation component, has suggested that they might even be willing to alter sampling arrangements to correspond to PCI needs.

B. EVALUATION TASKS

The following basic tasks will comprise the Native Village Evaluation Component:

1. The selection of Native field evaluators from each of the five selected villages. It is probable that the same field evaluator can serve for both Onick and Chauthbaluk because of their proximity and common language. All field evaluation will be bilingual;

2. The detailed planning of the Native Village Evaluation Component by the Professional Resource Team in Fairbanks;

3. The development and selection of the most appropriate data gathering and recording instruments by the Professional Resource Team. These data collection instruments might include such techniques as absenteeism records in the form of logs and personal diaries; participant diaries and audience reaction sheets; tape recorded interviews with a cross section of Native villages using both structured and open ended formats; and structured bilingual attitude surveys, utility questionnaire formats;

4. Base-line data collection from all available sources and the preparation of detailed village profiles for each of the five selected villages. To be done jointly by the Professional Resource Team and the Native Field Evaluation Team;

5. An intensive initial training program for the Native Field Evaluation Team in Fairbanks;

6. A continuous training and evaluation assessment program to be continued on a regularly scheduled basis in the Selected Villages throughout the duration of the project;

7. Central record, storage and analysis of all field data in Anchorage. A preliminary and tentative schedule of activities is reflected on the following chart.

C. *SCHEDULE OF ACTIVITIES*

July – September 1974	Selection of Native field evaluators; Base-line data collection; Development of instrument data sheet and methods copy.
September 1974	Training Program – Fairbanks.
October 1974	Field Work Begins; First structured interview – Field Worker and Professional
November 1974	Review and assessment of field work – Fairbanks.
January 1975	Second structured interview -- Field.
February 1975	Review and assessment – Fairbanks.
May 1975	Third structured interview.
June – September 1975	Data compilation and analysis.
October – November 1975	Follow-up interviews in villages to include the five selected villages, two additional Demonstration villages, and two villages outside of the Demonstration.